REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7-28 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Further to distinctions of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner by telephone on May 20, 2008, applicants' representative believed the cited art is deficient for at least the reasons expounded on below. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-4 and 7-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Denning, *et al.* (US Publication 2002/0123915). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Denning, *et al.* does not disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it **expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim**. Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp., 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The **identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim**. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system and method that facilitates automated quality management and controls for one or more items appearing in a documentation set. Specifically, the system enables owners of a documentation set to measure the quality of a document, increase document quality, and/or track document quality measurements on an ongoing basis across the documentation set. Thus, the system enables interactive quality assessment of the items in the set and allows for bulk remediation of common quality problems across groups of documents within the set. To this end, independent claims 1 and 19 recite ***bulk remediation of a quality problem***

across disparate items, the bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items. Similarly, independent claim 20 recites ***repeating the determined strengths, removing the determined deficiencies, and correcting the identified problems from all instances in the documentation set.*** Further, independent claim 27 recites ***automatically deploys positive features of the quality actions that exceed a predetermined threshold to other topics or automatically applies a corrective action related to the quality actions that are lower than the predetermined threshold to other topics*** and independent claim 28 recites ***indicate further actions derived from topics with scores above and below a predetermined threshold that are automatically applied to the database collection of topics.*** Denning, *et al.* fails to teach these novel aspects.

Denning, *et al.* relates to a computerized business process that captures component nonconformance data elements at an inspection process level. The nonconformance data is gathered via network-based data capture screens and image capture workstations. The data is available for users, suppliers, and customers to view through a secure connection to a business entity's server system. Specifically, a web page is provided by the system for entering corrective actions. More specifically, the web page includes text boxes for forwarding corrective action requests to a user and for indicating the sender of the corrective action requests. Additionally, the user may enter a requirement type, a requirement, a location where found, and a findings type using pull down menus. Furthermore, the web page includes text boxes that are employed by a user to enter detailed descriptions of the findings and a cross reference document. However, the system disclosed by Denning, *et al.* does not teach or suggest applying the corrective action for an item to disparate items across the documentation set. (*See* page 4, [0045].) The Examiner asserts on pages 2-3 of the Final Office Action (dated March 24, 2008) that Denning, *et al.* teaches a rules engine that automatically applies the quality metrics to the items to facilitate interactive quality assessments of the items and bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items, the bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more item. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees with this assertion. The cited reference merely teaches user interfaces whereby users, suppliers, and customers access nonconforming component

information. In particular, the system disclosed by Denning, *et al.* is configured to provide a plurality of users, suppliers, and customers performing various cross-functions, access to nonconforming component repair information. However, Denning, *et al.* does not teach or suggest bulk remediation across disparate items in the documentation set.

Applicants' subject matter, in contrast, relates to a system and method to facilitate automated and interactive quality controls that are automatically applied to a technical documentation. In particular, a filter that has a predetermined threshold set up is employed, such that, scores below the threshold can indicate corrective actions that can be distributed in or applied across the documentation set. For example, it may be statistically determined that introductory subject matter is much more likely to be accessed and scrutinized by respective users of the documentation. Thus, commentary received regarding introductory type topics or subject matter can be analyzed and applied in a uniform manner across other items in the set (*e.g.,* add introductory paragraph to pseudo code examples) that also may have topics associated with this type subject matter. (*See* page 8, lines 9-21.) As another example, if it is determined that explanatory topics are generally rated or scored as not supplying enough examples, then it may be determined to add more examples to other explanatory items in the documentation set even if the respective items had no corresponding data that indicated such deficiency. (*See* page 14, lines 10-13.) ***Thus, the disclosed system teaches bulk remediation of a quality problem across items in a documentation set wherein the remediation includes modification of the content of the items***. For example, it can be determined that an item includes ambiguous, imprecise, or unclear wording, a broken hyperlink, a bug reported in a technology, an undetermined problem, a code portion not working, a feature request, a useful topic, incorrect information, legacy documentation that had not been updated, poorly organized information, previously resolved issue, spelling error, not enough information provided for a topic. Furthermore, a need for a code example in a subsequent programming language, a need for an associated link, a need for a code example, *etc.* can be determined. The disclosed system performs corrective actions to correct the aforementioned problems in an item as well as in the remaining items in the documentation set. Denning, *et al.* is silent with respect to the aforementioned novel aspects. Further, Denning, *et al.* does not teach or suggest repeating determined

strengths, removing determined deficiencies, and correcting identified problems from all instances in the documentation set as recited in independent claim 20. Furthermore, Denning, *et al.* fails to teach automatically deploying positive features of the quality actions that exceed a predetermined threshold ***to other topics*** or automatically applying a corrective action related to the quality actions that are lower than the predetermined threshold ***to other topics***, as recited in independent claim 27. Denning, *et al.* merely teaches a system for accessing aircraft engine component nonconformance information by supply chain parties including internal users, suppliers, and external customers but fails to teach or suggest automatic application of actions derived from topics with scores above and below a predetermined threshold to a database collection of topics, as recited in independent claim 28.

In view of at least the foregoing, it can be seen that Denning, *et al.* does not teach each and every feature of the subject claims, and thus fails to anticipate the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP492US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731